

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added, cancelled or amended.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1-60 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-16, 18-21, 24-26, 29-33, 35-38, 41-43, 45-46, 48-51, 54-56 and 58-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,125 to Paroz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,857,102 to Bickmore et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,710,790 to Fagioli; claims 5, 17, 22, 34, 39, 47, 52 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz et al., Bickmore et al., Fagioli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105 to Martin, Jr; claims 6, 23, 40 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz et al., Bickmore et al., Fagioli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,003,067 to Suzuki et al.; and claims 10-11, 27-28, 44 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz et al., Bickmore et al., Fagioli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,363 to Rosenblatt et al. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of the claims based in part on the teachings of Bickmore et al., the Office Action appears to misunderstand certain features of the present invention and/or the operation of Bickmore et al. Bickmore et al. is directed to a system that resizes (reauthors) the amount of data to be sent to a device having a limited display area, so that a user of that device can readily review the data on the small display of that device. A separate host node receives a document request from the user of the small display device, and the host node then determines the amount of data to be sent to the small display device, so that the document can be displayed appropriately. This may involve removing icons or other things from the document.

Turning now to the features recited in claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Bickmore et al. teaches the claimed screen information transmission means provided at a device to be operated. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. The element that most closely corresponds to the claimed “device to be operated” is the limited display area device 510 of Figure 6 of Bickmore et al., whereby a host node determines the amount of data to be sent to the limited display area device, for display by that device. There is no transmitting data of an analysis result by Bickmore et al.’s limited display area device 510; rather, the host device determines the appropriate amount of data (re-authored data) to be sent to the limited display area device 510. Further, there is no teaching in Bickmore et al. of sending only data in an active window in the limited display area of the limited display area device 510.

On page 18 of the Office Action, it asserts that Bickmore et al.’s host node 570 corresponds to the claimed device to be operated, and that Bickmore et al.’s limited display area device 510 corresponds to the claimed operation side terminal. This appears backwards to what a more reasonable determination of what is the case, and in any event it still does not teach or suggest the features recited in claim 1 with respect to the screen information transmission means. Rather, the limited display area device 510 is not performing any remote operation of the host node 570, but rather the host node 570 is being used to tailor the amount of data for a document requested by the limited display area device 510 so that the document can be properly displayed on a small display of the limited display area device 510. To put it more bluntly, there is no determination of an active window in the host device 570, and there is no determination of which objects are displayed in an active window in the host device 570.

It appears that the Office Action is changing the operation of Bickmore et al.’s system such that the host device 570 is now to emulate a small display area on its large display area, to then determine an amount of a document that can fit in this small display area, and then to send that document amount to the limited area display device 510. However, this is not how Bickmore et al.’s system operates. Rather, Bickmore et al.’s host node 570 determines an amount of a document to send to the limited area display device 510 based on information provided to it by the limited area display device 510, and does not make an ‘active window’ on its (presumably larger) display that simulates the limited display area. Once the determination of the document amount has been determined by Bickmore et al.’s host node

570, that document amount is sent to the limited area display device 510, for display on that device.

Also, in response to the comments regarding the broad interpretation of “provided on said device to be operated” on page 18 of the Office Action, please note that claim 1 is a “means plus function” claim, and as such must be interpreted in light of the specification. In that regard, see Figure 1 of the drawings, whereby the screen information transmission unit 104 provided in the computer 100 is clearly a separate device from the terminal device 101, whereby claim 1 has to be interpreted based on this description in the specification and drawings.

Accordingly, since Bickmore et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed screen information transmission means, and since the other cited art of record does not rectify those shortcomings of Bickmore et al., presently pending independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record.

Since the other presently pending independent claims under rejection recite similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, those independent claims are also patentable over the cited art of record.

With respect to dependent claims 15 and 16, the Office Action asserts that Paroz teaches the features recited in those claims. Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, page 10 of the Office Action asserts that “If no moving or still images were shown on the first computing device’s user interface, screen analysis would not perform any picture data extraction, including analyzing the logic of those images, because there would be none to perform.” However, this misses an essential feature of claims 15 and 16, in which the screen of the device to be operated includes both picture information and non-picture information, and in the case where only non-picture information is provided on the screen of the device to be operated, the screen analysis means does not perform any analysis (the non-picture information is ignored), whereby the screen information transmission means does not transmit anything to the operation side terminal in that instance.

In Paroz, on the contrary, non-picture information would be transmitted from one computing device to another computing device in such a circumstance, whereby that does not meet the specific features recited in claims 15 and 16.

Since the other cited art of record does not rectify these shortcomings of Paroz, dependent claims 15 and 16 are patentable for these additional reasons.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 16, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819